Case 3:20-cv-04688-RS Document 657-6 Filed 09/01/25 Page 1 of 10

EXHIBIT E

BLACK - DIRECT / SANTACANA

1725

1 | West Sacramento.

- Q. Now, Dr. Hochman opines that there are no technical barriers to Google relinking pseudonymous data back to the user. Do you agree with that?
- A. I don't agree. There are formidable technical barriers,
 as well as policy barriers, to reidentification. We've seen a
 number of those policies. For example, you're not allowed to
 fingerprint. You're not allowed to intermix certain kinds of
 data to create what are called join risks. So this is a very
 strict rule within Google, from what I can tell from the
 testimony.
- Q. Did you see, in the evidence in this case, or in

 Dr. Hochman's report, that any person out of the 97,992,376

 class members was reidentified by Google or anyone else using their pseudonymous data?
- 16 A. No. He and I agree that there's no evidence showing this
 17 has ever happened.
- Q. Did you see any evidence in this case, for that matter, that any of the pseudonymous data in question was misused by anyone or otherwise leaked outside of the apartments that are locked down?
- 22 A. I don't think there's any evidence of that ever happening.
- 23 Q. Now, you mentioned a theoretical risk. Can you please 24 explain to the jury what you mean by "theoretical risk"?
- 25 A. Dr. Hochman has an opinion that he believes that, in

theory, joining certain information could lead to disclosure or the reidentifying of certain individuals. He gave some ideas in his report about how that might happen. But, once again, we both agree there's no evidence showing it has happened. And so he's offering what is, more or less, a theoretical opinion and admits that no actual reidentification has ever occurred, according to the evidence.

- Q. I'm going to shorten you up a little bit.
- 9 **A.** That's fine with me.
- 10 **Q.** So, Professor Black, can you explain to the jury what 11 you're trying to convey with this slide?
 - A. Sure.

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So there are a number of reasons that in a third-party app, data is being sent to Google, and we've heard about all of these in the trial. The number one that we've heard over and over is analytics. That's when GA4F is sending data on behalf of the app itself, and Google's providing a free service to receive and collate that information so that the developer can look at it later. That's called analytics.

Fraud prevention, Mr. Ganem talked about it to some extent. If a bad guy can simulate clicking on a button a thousand times a second and get revenue, they will do that. In fact, they do try to do that sort of thing. Google is very vigorous in preventing that, in stopping the fraudsters.

Google also has an accredited ad program. Their ads are

```
1 | maybe it's not too hard to link it to an identity, it lives in
```

- 2 sort of a gray area between pseudonymous and an explicit
- 3 | identifier.
- 4 | Q. And does pattern recognition have anything to do with
- 5 reidentifying people?
- 6 A. Sure. Fingerprinting is one form of pattern recognition,
- 7 | in fact.
- 8 **Q.** And there are other forms of pattern recognition; correct?
- 9 A. Sure. Fingerprint scanners are pattern recognizers.
- 10 Q. And have you come across, in your work, the term "mosaic"
- 11 | in terms of reidentifying people?
- 12 A. Maybe there's a product called Mosaic that I've heard of.
- 13 | I'm not sure -- I can't recall.
- 14 Q. You haven't seen that in -- within Google?
- 15 **A.** Something called Mosaic within Google?
- 16 **Q.** Yeah.
- 17 | A. I don't think I've heard of that.
- 18 Q. Okay. By the way, do you use Gemini?
- 19 **A.** Very carefully.
- 20 Q. Did you ever think about asking Gemini whether Google
- 21 | could reidentify people at a --
- MR. SANTACANA: Objection. Relevance and 403.
- 23 **THE COURT:** What's your response to that?
- MR. DAVID BOIES: I'm just inquiring whether he's done
- 25 | it, Your Honor. I think that --

```
How about the relevance issue?
 1
              THE COURT:
              MR. DAVID BOIES: Well, relevance is Google Gemini --
 2
              THE COURT: Well, we need to take a break, so why
 3
     don't I let the jury go, and then you can explain this to me.
 4
 5
          Members of the jury, remember my admonitions not to
     discuss this amongst yourselves or with anyone else, and we'll
 6
    be back in 15 minutes.
 7
        (Proceedings were heard out of the presence of the jury.)
 8
              THE COURT: All right. We're out of the presence of
 9
     the jury.
10
          What is this about?
11
              MR. DAVID BOIES: Well, Gemini, you know, talks about
12
     all the ways that they can reidentify -- talks about all the
13
     ways that Google can reidentify people.
14
              THE COURT: What is Gemini?
15
16
              MR. DAVID BOIES: Gemini is their AI. Gemini is --
17
              THE COURT: Google's AI?
              MR. DAVID BOIES: Yeah.
18
              THE COURT: Can you just step down for a moment?
19
     Thank you.
20
              MR. DAVID BOIES: Gemini is the Google artificial
21
     intelligence thing. It's like ChatGPT but it's from Google.
22
23
              THE COURT: All right.
              MR. DAVID BOIES: And that would be an easy way for
24
25
     anybody who really wanted to find out whether they could
```

reidentify.

He's testified -- you know, the witness has testified the way he has about identification and reidentification.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. DAVID BOIES: And he has, you know, testified --

THE COURT: You're asking the theoretical question of whether or not you could use Gemini to reidentify people?

MR. DAVID BOIES: That's one thing, and also what Gemini says about the ease of reidentification.

THE COURT: Well, okay.

Mr. Santacana.

MR. SANTACANA: Your Honor, I think you can understand where he's headed. If you look at what was put in my binder, I think it was put in yours in the opening flap, is Exhibit 49.

We don't stipulate to the authenticity of this, but it looks like somebody typed into Gemini a question about what Google can and can't do with its technology, and they want to admit its response into this trial.

Now, I don't know if this has ever been done, but I don't think this should be the first time. I have an authenticity objection, a 403 objection, a relevance objection. It's a chatbot. It's not evidence.

THE COURT: You can ask him -- because he's gone into the question of how difficult it is or impossible to reidentify, and you can ask him whether or not -- you can probe

```
BLACK - CROSS / DAVID BOIES
     that and say, "Could you do it by this way or this way?"
 1
 2
     That's okay.
          But you're not going to start introducing a whole line of
 3
     inquiry about AI and what AI might be able to do someday.
 4
 5
     That, you're not going to do.
          So but if you just -- you know, you can ask -- what's
 6
     wrong with him asking whether or not this Google product could
 7
     theoretically reidentify somebody?
 8
              MR. SANTACANA: I don't have an objection to that,
 9
     Your Honor. It's not in their opening report, and I assume --
10
     I don't know if he's in the room --
11
              THE COURT: Well, but he's kind of probing something
12
     he did testify about --
13
              MR. SANTACANA: Yeah.
14
                         -- which is the difficulty of
15
              THE COURT:
16
     reidentification.
              MR. SANTACANA: Yeah, I don't have an objection to him
17
     asking that question. Obviously, this is post-class period,
18
     but Your Honor overruled an earlier objection on that.
19
              THE COURT:
20
                          Okay.
              MR. DAVID BOIES: And perhaps we --
21
              THE COURT: But we're not going to -- don't even try
22
```

MR. DAVID BOIES: Yes, sir. We will leave to another

23

24

25

me on --

day whether that's a party admission.

```
Okay. Well, we don't have any other days.
 1
              THE COURT:
          So I've just gotten a binder with a lot of stuff in it. I
 2
     am really counting on us being able to conclude all evidence
 3
     today.
 4
 5
              MR. DAVID BOIES: We will do that, Your Honor.
              THE COURT:
                          Right?
 6
              MR. SANTACANA: Yes, as far as I'm concerned.
 7
              THE COURT: I mean, because otherwise we're going to
 8
     have closing arguments on Tuesday; and I think, for everybody,
 9
     it's better not to have, like, an hour or 45 minutes of
10
11
     testimony and then go into closing. So let's really try to --
              MR. SANTACANA: We have no more evidence.
12
13
              THE COURT: -- to clean it -- okay.
          Good.
14
                 Thank you.
              MR. DAVID BOIES: Thank you.
15
16
                       (Recess taken at 12:07 p.m.)
                  (Proceedings resumed at 12:21 p.m.)
17
          (Proceedings were heard out of the presence of the jury.)
18
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
19
              MR. SANTACANA: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
20
              THE COURT: We're outside the presence of the jury.
21
              MR. SANTACANA: Your Honor, I would like to raise one
22
23
     more issue with respect to Gemini. If I could just have a
24
     moment.
          We've consulted with our client and other counsel, and we
25
```

have a serious objection to the line of questioning on 403 grounds.

We're here at the end of this trial. Gemini and AI have never come up. There's no evidence about it, and my concern -- our collective serious concern is that Mr. Boies' line of questioning is designed to invite members of the jury to ask Google's chatbot about what's going on in this case.

There was already one question about what could be queried of the chatbot, and an exhibit in your binder is a query that the plaintiffs put in that says, "Could Google reidentify data using machine learning?" And they apparently intended to admit that into evidence. The response of this chatbot, which we all know, like ChatGPT, are prone to all kinds of things that are not reliable.

So my request, Your Honor, is that Mr. Boies be ordered to move on. It's not relevant. It's post-class period. It's prejudicial, and it may invite the jury to do things they shouldn't be doing.

He can prove his points in a variety of ways if he'd like, but not in a way that invites members, people who -- I mean, we've all talked about AI for two years, people who may be tempted to take his advice and actually ask Gemini what they apparently wanted to put into evidence.

MR. DAVID BOIES: I think I can move on, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. That takes care of that.

```
1
     Thank you.
          Yeah, I think it's a good -- it's a good decision on your
 2
     part.
 3
              MR. DAVID BOIES: Okay.
 4
 5
              MR. SANTACANA: Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. Let's bring in the jury.
 6
              MR. DAVID BOIES: Someday I do want to bring it in as
 7
     an admission.
 8
              THE COURT:
                          I admire your efforts.
 9
          (Proceedings were heard in the presence of the jury.)
10
11
              THE COURT: The jury is present.
          Mr. Boies.
12
13
              MR. DAVID BOIES: Thank you, Your Honor.
     BY MR. DAVID BOIES:
14
          Let me try and move through this as quickly as I can.
15
16
          First, you talked about Exhibit 442. Do you recall that?
          The UUAD log, yes.
17
     Α.
18
          And you described that as showing sWAA-on data. Do you
     recall that?
19
20
     Α.
          Correct.
          Now, that was data that was collected from the plaintiffs;
21
     correct?
22
          It was collected from Google corresponding to the
23
     plaintiffs.
24
          That is, it is Google's collection of data from the
25
```